



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"Mr. Gladstone's attempt to introduce prematurely into international politics the principles of the gospel." Mr. Gladstone assimilated whatever of exalted truth he met in his reading. He certainly had read "Casa Guidi Windows." But neither the depth nor the extent of Lord Rosebery's reading, nor yet the kind of matter he assimilates from it, is known to the public, save by indirect inference.

Commercial Selfishness and War.

BY JOSIAH W. LEEDS.

The writer of the lately published brief monograph on Wiclif's anti-war views has received some interesting responses in connection therewith. One of these is from John A. Kasson, former minister to Germany, lately special commissioner to negotiate treaties of commercial reciprocity between the United States and several foreign countries. It may be remembered that, disappointed at the non-ratification by the late Congress of a successfully negotiated treaty of this kind, he declined to accept the considerable compensation which was due to him for his services. The recent allusions in the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* to a commercialism that is selfish, and, in the last issue, to certain "beneficent reciprocity provisions in our present tariff" which, if properly availed of, ought to loosen the clutches of this baneful and war-stimulating selfishness, give appositeness to the sentiments of the above-named experienced diplomatist. He says, in his personal letter, which, I believe, I may helpfully quote:

"Without discussing the causes as I interpret them, it is evident to me that a very great change has occurred in the Councils of European nations in my own lifetime in respect to international war. There is a deeper sense of the obligations of justice between nations, and an increasing disposition to yield to them without the application of force. There is also an increasing reluctance to employ force to establish an international right,—a longer patience in negotiation. But the preaching of peace must go on until the selfishness inherent in human nature is itself brought under control; for that individual selfishness is aggregated in government, and is there, I am sorry to say, most commonly greatly apprehended as 'patriotic,' quite independently of the question of right or wrong which may be involved.

"Accept my thanks for your sympathetic allusion to my late work. From present signs I should say that only the application of retaliatory selfishness by Europe will convert our politicians to the principle that reciprocal fair dealing is wiser than arbitrary and exclusive selfishness among nations, as it is admitted to be between individuals.*

"Your allusions to the Emperor (the father of Emperor William) and Empress Frederick remind me of

his attitude in respect to war, as shown in his conversation with me just before his accession to the throne. I had complimented him upon the distinction he had acquired in the then late wars. He sadly shook his head, as if visions of past battlefields were passing before his eyes, and said: 'I hope never to see another war while I live.'"

It was stated at the time of the decease of the above, the Emperor Frederick William (1888), after a reign of but a few months, that, had not his life been thus early terminated, he would have carried out certain designs touching the Alsace-Lorraine trouble, which would have tended to definitely lessen the tension and hereditary jealousy between France and Germany. As to his doubtless altogether sincere ejaculation about war, he was well aware of the mental suffering it had brought to his sister, the Princess Alice. "Accursed war! May I never see another shot fired!" were the vehement words of Sir Charles Napier, in the midst of his military triumphs in India. Similarly frank was the testimony of General Sheridan, of whom Cardinal Gibbons said, in his arraignment of war upon the opening of the new century: "Happening to converse with General Sheridan, I questioned him about his Virginia campaign. His face assumed an expression of sadness, and with a mournful voice he said he hoped never to witness another war."

The Brutality of War.

BY EDWARD ATKINSON.

It may not be questioned that in the progress of the evolution of modern institutions many problems have been subjected to the arbitrament of war. It may not be doubted that in the conduct of war many of the greatest men of the world have attained a rightful position of power and influence; none higher than Washington, the dominating figure in the American Revolution. Yet to such men peace and goodwill among the nations have been the objects sought by war. Witness Washington's farewell address. To none has it been more plain than to these great leaders that wars have been necessary only because of the survival of the brute in man. All wars in defence of liberty and in the support of the rights of man have, in their judgment, been made necessary by the brutality of rulers or of the nations which have attempted to maintain oppression.

I shall, therefore, try to mark the stage which we have reached in the suppression of the brute and in the development of man, by dealing with the brutality of war. If the myths in regard to the age of chivalry have any foundation in fact, warfare, both private and public, was then conducted on principles of honor. Men met face to face and fought out their quarrels in a fair and courageous manner. Lying, cheating, ambushing, and stabbing in the back were deemed the acts of cowards and assassins. Such base practices disgraced those who committed them.

We have changed all that. Whatever may be the high and honorable character of the military and naval officers of to-day—and none can be rightly esteemed more highly for these attributes than the greater number of this class, both in this and other countries—yet the

*As manifesting the interest which John A. Kasson has long felt in the promotion of peace through the promulgation of righteous treaties, he wrote the inditer of this article, when ambassador at Berlin, and also at that time (1884) representative of the United States at the notable Berlin Conference on the Congo treaty: "The Conference has accepted the principle of exemption of all private persons and property from the disturbances of war on the rivers and other waters of the country. But the American proposition goes farther; and the assent of all the great powers except France is given to the neutralization of the entire Congo region in time of war, including the reference to mediation or arbitration of difficulties between the local territorial powers. Germany gives hearty support to it. This is still pending, in the hope that France will yet agree in whole or in part."

application of science and invention to the art and conduct of war compels these otherwise honorable leaders to commit every base act of fraud and deception that would disgrace any man occupied in the arts of peace.

In the days of chivalry knights supplied themselves with artificial weapons, with which nature had endowed bulls and rams. The men then following the instinct of the brute placed themselves opposite at a short distance, and charging after the manner of brutes, sought to kill or disable their opponents. The analogy is found in many brutes. Alligators and crocodiles are clad in natural armor. They seek to smash the plates with their tails or their jaws, as the knights sought to smash the plate armor with the mace, the bludgeon, or the battle ax.

The victor in the tournament, like the survivor in a cock fight, then flaunted his banner as the game cock flaunts his feathers, each crowing to the multitude in evidence of the survival of the stronger of the two animals. The story of "Don Quixote" exposed the whole folly of what was called chivalry, but the brute element in which it originated still rules many countries.

The analogy between the fighting biped and the fighting quadruped can be carried to almost any extent. The gaudy feathers and trappings of the modern soldier find their counterpart in the tail feathers of the turkey, and the red or yellow plumage of the carnivorous parrot that feeds on the lives of sheep.

In another sense, there is a close analogy between the fighting brutes, whether men or animals; their victims gradually defend themselves; one through the instincts of nature, the other by invention and the methods of art.

The so-called lower animals learn to combine and, by mere force of numbers, to stop the aggressions of the carnivora. They may be said to have organized the first trade unions. By combination and by not preying upon each other, the grass-feeding animals survived, as the great masses of working men and merchants have successfully resisted the aggressions of the military caste, in the guilds of old time, by the organizations of the Hanseatic League, in the trades unions and the like.

The military caste of former days not only preyed upon the common people, but, being of a lower type of animals, they also preyed upon each other, thus lessening their relative numbers by killing themselves off. This is what happened in the Wars of the Roses, which so reduced the numbers of the military caste in England for the time being, as to make way for the true progress of the English-speaking people in the higher arts of peace.

It, however, remained for modern science and invention to expose the grotesque brutality of war so fully that the efforts of all the great masters of the art of war are now being devoted to the maintenance of peace. They are scared. They do not dare set in motion the great forces which they have organized, lest both nations should be destroyed. That accounts for the Arbitration Conference at The Hague. The rulers feared the great wars, but you will observe that they refuse to arbitrate when a big nation attacks a little one. The independence of Finland, the criminal aggression in the Philippine Islands, and the suppression of the South African republics cannot be referred to the Court of Arbitration.

The military or aggressive classes have also exhibited a survival of the brute instincts by their efforts to sup-

press the inventions of science in the conduct of war. One of the great civilian inventors of weapons remarked to me the other day that had it been left to the military class to invent weapons they would have been fighting to-day with stone axes and wooden clubs.

Before the invention of gunpowder, the knight, clad in armor, rode rough shod wherever he pleased, "commandeering," to use a modern term, the supplies needed by his retainers; that is to say, robbing the people while devastating the country, and burning the houses of those who resisted. We witness this type of the survival of the brute in the war in South Africa.

But the knight clad in armor soon learned to keep out of the way of the common man with the gun, as the British line officers have vainly tried to keep out of the way of the sharpshooters armed with the rifle; colonels and majors dismounting, and with the captains and other line officers taking off their trappings, sheathing their swords, falling into the ranks and taking on the same mud in which the privates have been forced to march, trying vainly to conceal themselves from the sharpshooters. The proportion of officers killed and wounded in the Boer war is said to be two and one half to three times the number of privates.

In the long run, mental energy directed to the peaceful pursuits of science and invention will overcome the brutal energy of war. The force of commerce will suppress the military caste, which can now only exist by combining with the courage of the higher carnivora, like that of the King of Beasts, the treacherous and sneaking methods of the fox, the hyena, the wolf and the jackal. In other words, the master of the art of war must now use every effort to betray, to deceive, to spy, to ambush, to stab in the back, to get the advantage of the better gun, and by using every treacherous device that would disgrace the merchant, the manufacturer, the banker or any other master of the higher arts on which peace, progress and civilization now rests. Such is military glory! Witness Funston.

It has been well said by Professor Long, late of the Leland Stanford University, that "Naval warfare has become a very dangerous branch of mechanical engineering." To which may be added the remark that it is a very much under-paid branch. It offers no career to men who are capable of practicing mechanical engineering in the higher pursuits of peace. That is the reason why so many graduates of the Naval Academy quit the navy after a short term of service to take charge of great works in the manufacture of the implements of peace.

A great deal of physical courage is imputed to the soldier. It is the common attribute of man. There are very few cowards, and they are rather to be pitied than blamed; it is a matter of temperament. The man who pretends to enjoy fighting for its own sake is either a mere brute, a fool, or a knave. True men risk their lives at the call of duty, and overcome their fears. Even physical cowards will fight when their will is more powerful than their dread.

There is more true heroism displayed every year by the firemen in our cities than has been disclosed in the Spanish or the Boer war, or in the Philippine Islands. The policemen have a much higher standard of courage than the soldier. The soldier, flanked by his comrades, is often more afraid to run away than he is to advance;

but the policeman, standing alone without support, faces danger during every hour of his service; often greater than that to which the soldier is exposed. Yet there is room for progress even in suppressing mobs who are committing violence. If I were mayor, and wanted to suppress a mob, I should call out the firemen and use cold water instead of bullets. Which of you would not run, as if the devil were after him, in the face of a steam fire engine? Which horses would you get out of the way of the quickest, the engine horses or those ridden by the Boston Lancers?

Now, let me call your attention to one of the most singular developments of commerce towards the suppression of war, which has yet attracted very little notice: the manufacture of and commerce in the implements of carnage. The forces of science and invention may stop aggressive warfare, leading to permanent conditions of peace among nations, even if war is not condemned socially and morally. In naval conflicts has not the admiral become the subordinate of the engineer? Is it not admitted that the Spaniards possess as much courage as ourselves? But did it count for anything in the contest with the mechanics and engineers who worked the better machines of the Americans? Our admirals had nothing to do except to put the ships in position; then the engineers and machinists in charge of the mechanism demolished the poor incapable Spaniards, slaughtering them so awfully that Commodore Philip was shocked by the shouts of victory, and suppressed them. We are informed that military men in Europe have reached the conclusion that the improvements in killing implements have increased the power of defence so that the ratio in point of numbers is one man on the defensive to ten on the aggressive. Has not this been greatly due to the power of the trained sharpshooter to snipe the line officers? This has made it necessary for each great army of Europe to have its trained sharpshooters who may kill the officers and spare the privates. I have referred to the success of the Boer sharpshooters in this matter.

It now seems probable that the inventions of the submarine boat, and of the great explosive called "Maximite" have already rendered all our great battleships nothing but masses of old junk. If the Holland boat can attack a battleship under water, that is the end of the matter. No crew can be brought up to the scratch against an invisible foe. If "Maximite" is so powerful that no ship that can float can carry armor enough for defence, then what is the use of the battleship? All we can do with them will be to do what the British have been doing with their battleships which are over ten years old, making targets of them to see how quickly the new ships can demolish them. How soon will our new battleships thus be made targets of? Very soon, I hope.

From the earliest history of the art of war the military classes have resisted the introduction of improved machines because they have compelled them to alter all their tactics and to adjust the art of war to the demands of these pestilent inventors. I have referred to the fact that no great invention in the art of killing has ever been discovered by a military man. All the great inventors in the matter of arms, battleships and engines have been civilians. I am not so familiar with the continental names as the American and English. Witness the list: Whitney, the inventor of the cotton gin, a school master,

also inventor of the interchangeable gun machinery; Krupp, Remington, the two Maxims, Whitehead, Walmsley, Nordenfeldt, Sir William Armstrong, Whitworth, Laird, Cramp, Holland, Winchester, Hotchkiss, Sharp, Colt, Spencer — all civilians seeking profits of commerce. Ericsson was a civilian although he had done a little military service. The "Monitor" had to be forced by private enterprise upon the Navy Department. I think a British naval officer, Captain Cowper Cowles, tried to improve on Ericsson's "Monitor," but his ship turned turtle and carried him and his crew to the bottom. We have heard of the Dahlgren and Rodman guns, the invention of military men, but they were mere slight changes that did not last.

Now, while the name of every great inventor of the implements of war is that of a civilian, it is interesting to observe that not one of these inventors has ever appeared in the ranks of the army or navy. None of these great inventors has ever been so imprudent as to expose himself to the use of his own invention by a personal test. They have been content with reaping large profits derived from supplying instruments of carnage. I believe that Mauser, Krag-Jorgensen and Martini-Henry rifles are also the inventions of civilians. This is not a proof that military and naval men may not possess great capacity for using men as pawns in the game of war, but inventive capacity is limited to the few, and the application of invention to the construction of implements of war has been one of the most profitable branches of commerce.

Inventors are sure to beat the military and naval men because the power of invention and of combining natural forces is a much higher type of mental energy than that which is required for the direction of military or naval forces. The only great men who have ever taken any part in the conduct of warfare have been men who had greater capacity as statesmen than the merely military officers.

If some one could invent a method by which the military and naval contests of the past could be put before the eye in action, like the vaudeville show of the cinematograph how grotesquely absurd the contests would appear, viewed from the light of reason and common-sense, and also how utterly brutal! Imagine, for instance, an exhibition of gladiators, putting before the eye the actual brutality and murder with the shouting audience. What would be the effect upon the modern mind? But you say these were the times of paganism; Christians were slaughtered in the arena, but never took any other part in such barbarism. Perhaps not, but I can see very little difference in the moral standard of the pagans who enjoyed the fights of the gladiators and of the so-called Christians of our own time who have slaughtered the poor people of the Philippine Islands in the name of the gospel because they made blind efforts to maintain their own liberty. If the actual brutality of the war in the Philippine Islands could have been photographed and brought before the eyes of the people of this country in a cinematograph picture, would there not have been one universal shout of horror and contempt for any body of men who could not deal with these people without committing such brutality?

Imagine next a group of knights engaged in contest with lances and maces. What would be the aspect of

chivalry? Nothing but the brutality of the contest would be apparent to-day. Suppose one could witness without a hazard the incidents of a great battle, free of the noise, excitement or personal interest in the issue—merely looking on and witnessing the carnage. The horror and brutality would only be equalled by the sense of folly and absurdity.

Suppose we could put in action the effort of one of our great steel-clad battleships trying to escape from the Holland submarine boat and trying to avoid the mashing of Maxim's latest explosive, presently witnessing the great, costly, cumbersome mass of engines and machinery utterly disabled, incapable of flight, incapable of steerage, begging for help to carry off the crew before the vessel should sink. What are we doing to-day? Paying out two to five millions of dollars each for a job lot of cruisers and battleships at the expense of the tax-payers with one hand, and with the other hiring Holland and Maxim to invent apparatus for their destruction, with another heavy expense at the cost of the tax-payers. But the end of this folly, brutality and absurdity is not far off.

Already, great masters of the art of war are again being compelled to admit their inability to cope with modern invention. It has become plain that the huge armies of Continental Europe have become incapable of service; that they will be nothing but great mobs fit only for carnage under rapid-firing guns, high explosives and sharpshooters armed with search-light rifles. It is already proposed to reduce the numbers of the forces and to employ only the sharpshooters. In other words, to employ only good mechanics who can skilfully direct the modern mechanism of war. That is one great step toward peace. What will be the next conviction of the military leaders and masters of the art of war?

When it becomes apparent that officers only commit suicide when attempting to give direction to the sharp-shooting privates, the military classes, may, and would if they possessed common sense, next propose to dispense with the sharp-shooting privates. What would be the next step? For the officers to fight it out among themselves with swords and pistols? Not a bit of it. The art of war is now taught by moving puppets on a board. I have never seen the German game called "Kriegspiel," which has been adopted in this country. It has been described to me. Puppets representing great organized forces of armed men are placed in different positions under the direction of an officer on each side, each to see which can get the better of the other. A certain force of puppets is arrayed and sent in to the attack of a defended position. The exact time required for a charge is known. The exact number that will be killed and wounded under ordinary conditions is known. The number that will reach the defended position is estimated, and then one point in the game is admitted to be won or lost. Human lives do not count in this game. But they do count in real war, and when it becomes plain that only skilled mechanics trained as sharpshooters can be of any destructive service; when it becomes plain to the officers that in dealing with them in ratio to the number of each, three officers will be killed to one private, or more, the game of actual war will not be attractive. The brutes in whom the brutal instinct survives would be incapable of continuing that skilled game of war. Men in whom reason has attained

supremacy would witness the utter absurdity and the folly of committing suicide. "Why not, then," the leading general says under a flag of truce to the other,—"why not put our sharpshooters in camp and fight this out on the Kriegspiel board with puppets? We will save our own lives, get our pay just the same, hold our supreme position and the one who wins will be admitted to be the victor without sacrificing a life on either side." That would be the logical ending of the application of science and invention to modern warfare, and that will be the end as soon as the function of reason becomes more powerful than the brute instinct in the military classes whose influence is now so baneful.

The Golden Rule in International Affairs.*

BY BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD.

The Golden Rule has been on the lips of the Christian world for nearly nineteen hundred years. It ought long ago to have become the controlling principle in all civilized social affairs, private, national and international. It contains in a condensed form the whole applied moral philosophy of life. But, strange to say, even its meaning has never been understood, except by a few people, and those mostly among the obscure. The admiration and praise of it uttered from pulpits and platforms, found in books, and sometimes heard in conversation, has been largely of a poetic, sentimental and esthetic character, like that bestowed upon a precious stone, an exquisite statue, or a rare specimen in a show case. "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them." In Greek, in English or in any other tongue, it is a sentence whose thought is so precise and complete, whose movement is so rhythmical, whose appeal to the moral instincts is so direct, that one can scarcely hear it uttered without feeling the rising in his eye of an esthetic tear. Thus is probably to be explained the fact that this great life principle, though so universally neglected and disobeyed, has been just as universally lauded.

The solemn and wonderful majesty of the Golden Rule, and likewise its everlasting verity and vitality, can be appreciated only when one looks carefully into the three elements which lie behind it and determine its formulation.

The first of these elements is the sense and understanding of justice which it assumes to exist in all men. One of the clearest things among human phenomena is the fact that men, not much matter how undeveloped, ignorant, or even wicked they may be, have a very clear knowledge of what is justice toward *themselves*. This sense manifests itself more often, perhaps, when injustice is done them. The Indian, for example, may be a wild, ignorant, violent son of the forest, but, standing face to face with the knowing white man, he comprehends very well how the latter ought to feel and act toward him.

Now the Golden Rule requires a man, with this clear sense of what ought to be done to *himself*, to set himself over into the place of the other man, and then do to the other man what he would have the other man do to him

*An address given at the Religious Congress, Buffalo, June 30.